

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The Abstract has been objected to as being in improper form; Claims 1 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Hayes; Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Arnett; and Claims 2-4 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Considering first then the Examiner's objection to the Abstract, it is to be noted that such has now been revised so as to not exceed 150 words in length and has been revised to contain language more acceptable with respect to U.S. patent practice and procedure.

Considering next then the rejection of Claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Hayes, it is noted that, insofar as the language of Claims 2-4 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter and since such claims have only been objected to, Claim 1 has now been amended so as to include a portion of the language from Claim 2 not found in the prior art, namely the limitation of abutment portions formed respectively at lower edges of the plate portions so as to be abutable against the housing. Insofar as a review of Hayes as well as the remaining references of record fails to teach or disclose this limitation and based upon the comments made by the Examiner in the Office Action, it is submitted that Claim 1 as now amended clearly patentably defines over the prior art of record. It is further noted that Claim 4 has now been placed in independent form.

Considering next then the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Arnett, it is submitted that, based upon the amendments noted above with regard to Claim 1, such claim is in condition for allowance. Claim 6

therefore is also considered to be allowable in view of its dependence from Claim 1. In addition, based upon the fact that a review of the teachings and disclosure of Arnett indicate that such would not be obviously combinable with Hayes, Claim 6 merits indication of allowability.

In view of the foregoing, an early and favorable Office Action is believed to be in order and the same is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

GJM:JDH\la

I:\ATTY\JDH\255426US-AM.DOC



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
James D. Hamilton  
Registration No. 28,421  
Attorneys of Record